location of the Court, as there were not many places included within its jurisdiction to the south of Krishnapurom. Most of the parties came from the west and they had better convenience to go to Kayankulam by backwater than to Krishnapurom. The parties living on the northern side found it difficult to go to the Court. The people of Kayankulam town who had to make greater use of the Court also experienced difficulties on account of the location of the Court at Krishnapurom. The town of Kayankulam was also rising in importance and had many public offices there. It was also a large commercial centre. The Government would not be put to additional expenditure in finding buildings for the Court. With the amount of Rs. 25 now paid as rent for the Court-house at Krishnapurom, it was possible to find a suitable building at Kayankulam also on hire. In view of the facts set forth above, the Member urged the necessity of transferring the Munsiff's Court at Krishnapurom to Kayankulam.

Dewan's reply.—This question had been brought forward at several sessions of the Assembly by the Members from Kayankulam. The Government, in consultation with the High Court, had decided that there was no necessity to transfer the Court to Kayankulam, as the people had no grounds for real grievance, the distance between Kayankulam and Krishnapuram being only two miles. It will not be possible to re-consider this decision in the near future.

44. Establishment of a Munsiff's Court at Changanacherry.

Mr. N. Trivikrama Kymal (Member, Changanacherry taluk) said that the need for a Munsiff's Court in the Changanacherry taluk was made the subject of representation in the Assembly several times by the Members of the taluk, that their representations had been consistently ignored by the Government, and that G. O. No. J. 6226, dated the 7th August 1915, was the last order on the subject declining to grant a Munsiff's Court for the place. The above order was based on the views expressed by the High Court that a Munsiff's Court was not necessary at Changanacherry. The recommendation of the High Court was against the opinion expressed by the District Judges of Alleppey and Kottayam and the several Munsiffs who had to deal with the cases from the Changanacherry taluk.

The Member next proceeded to examine the reasons given by the High Court in support of their view.

The first reason given by the High Court was that, to the people of the Puthuppalli *pakuthi* and to those of Vellavur and Vazhur *pakuthis*, which were under the jurisdiction of the Kottayam and Kanjirappalli Munsiff's Courts respectively, the existing arrangements were, in view of the shorter distances to Kottayam and Kanjirappalli, much more convenient than the placing of those *pakuthis* within the jurisdiction of a Court proposed to be established at Changanacherry. The Member said that the principle involved in the above reasoning was proximity and that the maximum and minimum distances from the Puthuppalli *pakuthi* to Kottayam and Changanacherry were 12 miles and 5 miles and 12 miles and 7 miles respectively. So, the inconvenience mentioned by the High Court was not, after all, so great.

The second ground mentioned by the High Court was that none of the five *pakuthis*, namely, Muttar, Ramankari, Velianad, Nilamperur and Changanacherry, which were within the jurisdiction of the Alleppey Munsiff's Court, were more than 15 miles from Alleppey and that that distance could be conveniently traversed in *vallams*, there being no dangerous backwaters to cross. To the above, the Member said that the question of proximity mentioned by the High Court in their first point was overlooked when they came to the second point. The maximum distance from Muttar and other places to Alleppey was more than 15 miles, whereas the maximum and minimum distances from those *pakuthis* to Changanacherry were only 4 miles and 2 miles respectively. The people of Nilamperur and Chennamkari had to cross the Vembanad *kayal* to reach Alleppey and that was one of the most dangerous backwaters in the State.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

The third reason advanced by the High Court in support of their view was that the inhabitants of portions of most of the six *pakuthis* within the jurisdiction of the Tiruvalla Munsiff's Court had, no doubt, to pass through Changanacherry to Tiruvalla but that the entire journey which, in no case exceeded 15 miles, could be accomplished by land, there being a very good road connecting Changanacherry with Tiruvalla. Even here the Member was of opinion that the question of proximity had been overlooked by the High Court. The distance from the Nedumkunnam *pakuthi* to Tiruvalla was 18 miles, and, such being the case, it was very difficult for the parties to attend the Court the same day they started from their houses. Also, there were no good roads from Nedumkunnam and other places to Changanacherry.

The fourth and last point mentioned by the High Court was that, it would not be possible to satisfactorily adjust the work of the Alleppey and Tiruvalla Munsiffs' Courts and the proposed Changanacherry Court and that, without causing inconvenience to the inhabitants of some of the *pakuthis* now within the jurisdiction of the Alleppey and Tiruvalla Munsiffs' Courts, it would not be possible to re-adjust the territorial jurisdiction in such a way as to reduce the volume of litigation in the Tiruvalla or Alleppey Munsiff's Court to such an extent that either or both of those Courts might be conveniently left to be worked by a single Munsiff. Regarding that argument the Member said that several adjustments and re-adjustments of the territorial jurisdiction of the Courts had been made in the past and that the several *pakuthis* of the Changanacherry taluk had at one time been placed under the jurisdiction of one Court and at other times under the jurisdiction of other Courts. According to the present statistics, the number of cases filed in the Alleppey Munsiff's Court from the 5 *pakuthis* of the Changanacherry taluk were only 239 and that there would still remain 4,410 cases in the Alleppey Courts. That would give sufficient work for two Munsiffs. The statistics of the past three or four years justified the above statement. If the Additional Munsiff's Court at Tiruvalla was transferred to Changanacherry and if it was found that the work at Tiruvalla could not be done by one Munsiff, then a Panchayat Court might with advantage be established at Tiruvalla. By the conversion of an Additional Munsiff's Court into a Principal Court, the additional expenditure that might have to be incurred would not exceed Rs. 100 per mensem. But that would be more than compensated for by the increased usefulness of the Court.

The Member, in conclusion, said that the arguments advanced by the High Court were not convincing and that the want of a Munsiff's Court was keenly felt at the place. He, therefore, prayed that the long-hoped-for Court might be opened at Changanacherry at least as a *Shashtipurthi* boon of His Highness the Maha Raja.

Mr. Cheriyan Varghese (Member, Trading Classes, Changanacherry) also argued on the same lines and added that the trading classes of the place in particular suffered much for want of a Munsiff's Court at Changanacherry.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

45. Establishment of a Munsiff's Court at Alwaye.

Mr. Ittoop Korathu (Member, Alengad taluk) said that the civil jurisdiction over the *pakuthis* of the Alengad taluk was vested in the Parur and Perumbavur Munsiffs' Courts and that over the *pakuthis* of Edappalli North and South, Thrikkakkara, Alwaye, Chengamanad, and Kothakulangara in the Perumbavur Munsiff's Court. The inhabitants of Edappalli and Thrikkakkara had to walk 20 and 23 miles before they could reach Perumbavur. But the people of all the above *pakuthis* could reach Alwaye more easily and with less difficulty by railway. Excepting the *pakuthis* mentioned above, there remained only the Kunnathunad taluk under the jurisdiction of the Perumbavur Court. The *pakuthis* of Aiykaranad and Chemmanad were nearer to the Muvattupuzha Court and the people of those *pakuthis* had several times requested the transfer of the *pakuthis* to the jurisdiction of the Muvattupuzha Court. That would also have the effect of increasing the number of cases on the file of the Muvattupuzha Munsiff's Court, which was

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly